DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 239 CS 210 473

AUTHOR Salwen, Michael B.
TITLE Credibility of a Newspaper Health Story: The Influence of Source and Source Intent.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Credibility; Health Materials; Higher Education; *Information Sources; *Mass Media Effects; Media Research; Newspapers; Persuasive Discourse; *Reader Response; Rhetorical Criticism; *Trust (Psychology)
IDENTIFIERS *News Sources

ABSTRACT

To discover the components of a trustworthy source, a study evaluated the credibility of health-related news stories. Subjects, 192 college undergraduates, read one of four random versions of a one-page newspaper story about aspirin's ability to ward off heart attacks. They were told that the sources for the articles were: a medical journal (high expertise and trustworthiness), a popular magazine (low expertise, high trustworthiness), and a pharmaceutical company (high expertise, with two versions of varying trustworthiness, claiming aspirin either did or did not lower the risk of heart attacks). Subjects then completed a questionnaire measuring the credibility of the source. Analysis found both expertise and trustworthiness to be valid components of credibility, but that thoroughness, objectivity, and clarity are also factors. Readers were found to judge the medical journal the most thorough and trustworthy source; however, contrary to expectations, the popular magazine was judged no more trustworthy than the aspirin manufacturer. Findings also indicated that the subjects judged the neutral stance of the journal and magazine to be highly credible, while the pharmaceutical company was distrusted regardless of whether it claimed aspirin prevented heart attacks or not. (References and tables of data are appended.) (SKC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281239

Credibility of a Newspaper Health Story: The Influence of Source and Source Intent

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

By

Michael B. Salwen*
University of Miami
School of Communication
P.O. Box 248127
Coral Gables, FL 33124
(305) 284-2265

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael Salwen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Mass Communication and Society Division, San Antonio, Texas, 1987.

*The author is an assistant professor of Communication at the University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL. He gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Dan Pearson, a graduate student at the University of Miami.

CS210473

CREDIBILITY OF A NEWSPAPER HEALTH STORY: THE INFLUENCE OF SOURCE AND SOURCE INTENT

A good deal of research suggests that newspapers and other popular news media can be important instruments for diffusing information about public health.[1] But most news media rarely gather original information themselves. They usually rely on "sources" with various degrees of expertise and trustworthiness. Yet most mass media credibility research has focused on the content of the information being reported, or the media themselves, with little or no regard for the sources contacted by the media. A large body of accumulated research dealing with source credibility would suggest that the perceived credibility of the sources contacted by the news media could be an important factor toward understanding the public's perceived credibility of health-related information in the news media. This study presented respondents with a health-related news story, controlling for medium and content. Only source characteristics and source intent were manipulated and the effect on the respondents' evaluations of overall story credibility was observed.

Credibility has been viewed to be a function of several underlying dimensions, including the source's trustworthiness, expertise and intentions.[2] As Gandy concluded in his summary of the role of source credibility in peoples' decision-making processing:

> Credibility is seen to be a function of several factors, including what is known about source intentions, expertise and trustworthiness. Of course, estimates of expertise vary with the information being provided — an expert in animal husbandry is not necessarily a credible source of information about atomic waste disposal.3

As Gandy suggests, expertise relates to the source's competence with the particular information. But just what constitutes source trustworthiness is not so clear. As far back as 1953, Hovland, Janis, and Kelly suggested that persuasive or manipulative intent would reflect on a source's trustworthiness.[4] They suggested that respondents would be suspicious of a source with manipulative intent. Mass media credibility research since the classic studies by Hovland and his colleagues has moved away from focusing on the source of the message and has instead focused on the medium. This study attempted to return to a focus on the attributed source of the information in the newspapers on reader credibility.

Perhaps at least part of the explanation for the research shift toward the credibility of the medium rather than the attributed source is that credibility is one of the few theoretical frameworks in communication research that is of direct interest to the newspaper industry. Since credibility is assumed to be positively associated with believability, which is thought to sell newspapers, the newspaper industry has shown great interest in improving its credibility. The recent publication of a widely cited national newspaper credibility survey, sponsored by the American Society of Newspapers Editors, illustrates the newspaper industry's concern with credibility.[5] Despite the thoroughness of the ASNE study, credibility was conceptualized within the framework of the medium or the medium's content, with little or no regard for the sources contacted by newspapers. The early empirical research on credibility, however, did not overlook the importance of the source of the information.

In one of their classic credibility experiments, Hovland and Weiss controlled for the source of a health-related message.[6] They presented subjects arguments concerning whether anti-histimines should continue to be sold without prescriptions. In the high credibility condition, the

source was the New England Journal of Biology and Medicine. In the low credibility condition the source was a mass circulation monthly pictorial magazine. The researchers found strong evidence supporting their hypothesis that a high credibility source would be more persuasive than a low credibility source. They assumed that the underlying dimension of source expertise with the subject matter accounted for source credibility.

The earliest attempts to locate underlying dimensions of source credibility can be traced to Aristotle, who identified good sense, good moral character and good will as dimensions of source credibility.[7] Factor analytic methods have made it possible to successfully locate underlying dimensions of source credibility. Most of these studies have identified two or three principal dimensions.[8] In mass media research, the dimensions of trustworthiness, expertise and dynamism, first identified by Hovland and his colleagues, have been identified as dimensions of source credibility. In mass media research, trustworthiness and expertise have been most appropriate for print media sources while dynamism has been particularly relevant for broadcast media sources.[9]

A good deal of research dealing with source credibility has examined the dimension of source expertise. More, however, needs to be known about how trustworthiness relates to credibility. Underlying the present study is the assumption that source trustworthiness is associated with source intent. Research examining the influence of the source's intent on credibility is inconclusive.

In another of the early source credibility experiments dealing with source intent, Hovland and Mandell had subjects listen to an economist and a representative from an import firm advocate devaluation of U.S. currency (which would increase the profits of the firm) and found no differences in

credibility.[10] In the Hovland and Mandell study, both sources were high expertise sources. Walster, Aronson, and Abrahams wanted to know whether a source — even a usually low expertise source — who defied expectations of untrustworthiness would be judged as credible as a high expertise source?[11] They found that when they manipulated a prosecutor's argument where the prosecutor argued for less power for prosecutors, he was much more persuasive than a criminal who argued the same position. But the criminal was more persuasive than the prosecutor when the argument concerned more power for prosecutors. Their study suggests that a source who presents information contrary to his or her best interests might enhance his or her credibility.

The variable of source intent is missing from much of news media research dealing with source credibility. This is an important variable worth studying because oftentimes the news media contact sources with a vested interest in the information. Realizing that sources contacted by the news media may have a vested interest in the information they are commenting about, journalists have adopted the practice of contacting different sources with different viewpoints. But still little is known about how the audience judges the credibility of news stories that rely on sources that have a vested interest in the information.

It was determined that the credibility of public health sources would be examined in this study. Public health issues are regarded by most of the public as a technical issues. Therefore, the hypothesized dimension of source expertise with public health issues could be examined. Public health sources can also be manipulated for trustworthiess and intent.

Based on what is known about source credibility, seven research hypotheses were tested:

H1: Trustworthiness will be a dimension of source credibility in a newspaper story dealing with a public-health issue.

H2: Expertise will be a dimension of source credibility in a newspaper story dealing with a public-health issue.

H3: A health-related news story attributed to a source identified as a medical journal will be judged as more expert than a story attributed to a popular magazine.

H4: A health-related news story attributed to a source identified as a medical journal will be judged as more trustworthy than a story attributed to a pharmaceutical company.

H5: A health-related news story attributed to a popular journal will be judged as more trustworthy than a story attributed to a pharmaceutical company.

H6: A health-related news story attributed to a source identified as a pharmaceutical company presenting information contrary to its own best interest will be judged as more credible (trustworthy and expert) than a story attributed to a neutral source with no vested interest in the information.

H7: A health-related news story attributed to a source identified as a pharmaceutical company presenting information contrary to its own best interest will be judged as more credible than a story attributed to a pharmaceutical company presenting information in its own best interest.

METHOD

The sample consisted of 204 students enrolled in six undergraduate communication classes at a medium-sized, private university in the southeast during the second and third weeks of October, 1986. The results yielded 192 usable responses. The respondents were randomly presented any of four slightly different conditions of a news story that they were told appeared in a moderate-size daily newspaper in another state. They were told to read the story just as they would read any other story that appeared in the newspaper. They were also told that the journalism

program in the school was asking students to evaluate the stories to help the program determine what readers want from news stories.

The four story conditions, each one page long, described a national survey of 11,000 people. In three of the four conditions, the survey found that taking about one aspirin a day might reduce the likelihood of heart attacks among people with heart problems. The story used in this study was based on a story that appeared in the New York Times.[12] The original Times' story was reproduced in the form of a newspaper clipping and used the Bayer Company in a national print advertising campaign. For the purpose of this study the Times' story was shortened and rewritten to control for the source of the information. Many of the original quotes and paragraphs remained intact (see appendix).

There were three possible sources of information in the different story conditions: (1) The New England Journal of Medicine, (2) Ladies Home Journal, and the (3) Bayer Company. In the Bayer condition the story was written in either of two ways: Aspirin may reduce the likelihood of heart attacks among people who experienced heart attacks in the past, or aspirin may not reduce the likelihood of heart attacks among such people. The Bayer source was presented in these two forms to test the hypothesis that a source with good intent will be evaluated as more credible than a source with bad or neutral intent.

It may have been possible that a story content characteristic (i.e., that aspirin does or does not reduce the likelihood of heart attacks among people who experienced heart attacks) may have affected respondents' evaluations of story credibility. Therefore, the Bayer stories were administered and analyzed early to see whether the content had an effect on credibility. If story content did have an effect on respondents' evaluations of credibility, stories reporting the ineffectiveness of

aspirin in reducing heart attacks among former heart attack patients would be administered in the medical journal and popular journal conditions. The early analysis of the two Bayer conditions, however, showed no significant differences.

RESULTS

After reading the stories, the respondents completed a 28-item questionnaire attached to the back of each story. Each item asked the respondents to evaluate the story on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from +3 to -3 with a zero midpoint. The items were taken from other source credibility studies and focus groups with students attending a summer session at the university. The items sought to measure the dimensions of trustworthiness and expertise often thought to be associated with credibility as well as other items suggested from the focus groups.

A confirmatory factor analysis, using varimax orthogonol rotation was run to locate the predicted underlying dimensions of credibility. As is traditional in factor analysis, only those factors that attained eigenvalues of 1.0 (unity) or greater were examined[13] Only factors with three or more loadings were examined. There are no rules or widely accepted guidelines for what constitute acceptable factor loadings. In other factor analytic studies dealing with source credibility of mass media sources, Singletary[14] accepted .45 as a minimum factor loading; McCroskey and Jensen, in one of the more conservative studies, accepted a minimum factor loading of .60 with that item loading no higher than .40 on another factor.[15] This study took that more conservative approach. The factor analysis yielded a clean four-factor solution that explained 76 percent of the variance. Alpha reliability coefficients performed on each factor were high, ranging from .86 to .94. Eleven items failed to meet

the a priori criteria for loading on factors and are reported in Table 1 as residuals.

Table 1 About Here

As hypothesized, a factor that reflected characteristics associated with trustworthiness clearly emerged. The trustworthy factor, which accounted for 9 percent of the explained variance, was comprised of six items (believable, convincing, honest, sincere, true and trustworthy). A factor somewhat analogous to the hypothesized factor of expertise, "thoroughness," also emerged. The thoroughness factor, comprised of four items (complete, comprehensive, skillful and thorough), accounted for 78% of the explained variance. Some of the items that it was thought might relate to expertise failed to meet the a priori criteria for factor loadings. Some of these items, such as accurate, authoritative, correct, exact, expert, factual, precise, professional and reliable, were frequently mentioned as synonyms for expertise by subjects in the focus groups. It is comforting to note, however, that while these items failed to meet the strict a priori criteria of this study, they still loaded high on the thoroughness factor. The factor was named thoroughness rather than expertise because three of the four items seemed to suggest traits of completeness or thoroughness rather than deftness or expertise.

Two other factors also emerged. The objectivity factor (comprised of fair, impartial, objective and unbiased) accounted for 8 percent of the explained variance. The clarity factor (comprised of clear, readable and understandable) accounted for 6 percent of the explained variance. Since the main focus of the study is credibility, which is thought to consist of trustworthiness and expertise, special attention will be given to the

factors of trustworthiness and thoroughness (somewhat analogous to expertise). But the analyses will also examine the emergent factors of objectivity and clarity. It is worth analyzing all the factors since they are not totally independent from each other. Table 2, which shows the Pearson product moment correlations among the factors, suggests that the correlations are sufficiently high to show some overlap, but not so high as to be redundant.

Table 2 About Here

After reducing the items through factor analysis, scales were constructed using the summed equally weighted grand means of the items that loaded on the individual factors. The grand means for the scales were as follows: Thoroughness, 0.14; Trustworthiness, 0.89; Objectivity, 0.70; and Clarity, 1.30.

Hypotheses dealing with source intent were tested by examining respondents' evaluations of story thoroughness, trustworthiness, objectivity and clarity as functions of of source intent. Table 3 presents the results of one way ANOVAs of these four factors as functions of source intent. In the good intent story, Bayer reported that aspirin did not reduce the likelihood of heart attacks among people who experienced heart attacks. In the bad intent story, Bayer reported that aspirin could reduce the likelihood of heart attacks among such people. The neutral intent condition was comprised of the combined conditions of the medical journal and the popular journal stories since both the medical journal and the popular journal had no vested interest in the purported outcome.

All ANOVAs attained significance (see table 3). In each case, the neutral intent condition obtained the highest mean. When significance was found, a Scheffe's significance test was used to create a matrix to account for what pair or pairs of conditions accounted for the significance. The Scheffe test, the strictist a posteriori test of statistical significance that can be used with ANOVA, uses a single range value for all comparisons of means and thereby does not capitalize on chance likelihood of finding statistical significance when more than a single pair of means are contrasted.[16]

Table 3 About Here

As the four Scheffe tests in table 3 show, the neutral story was judged superior to one or the other Bayer stories on each of the four scales. The Scheffe tests revealed that the neutral intent stories were rated superior to the bad intent story on three of the scales (trustworthiness, objectivity and clarity) and superior to the good intent story on the thoroughness scale. The good intent condition received a negative score on trustworthiness. None of the Scheffe tests revealed any differences between the good intent and bad intent stories. As a result, the good intent and bad intent conditions were combined into a single "manufacturer" condition and the neutral intent condition was split into the medical journal and popular journal conditions to test further hypotheses.

To test hypotheses concerning source credibility, table 4 presents the results of the four ANOVAs examining respondents' evaluations of story thoroughness, trustworthiness, objectivity and clarity as functions of the source of the story. All the ANOVAs were significant at the .01 or .001 levels. In each case, the medical journal obtained the highest mean. The

Scheffe tests revealed that in three of these cases (thoroughness, trustworthiness and objectivity) the medical journal was evaluated superior to the other two sources. The medical journal was rated superior to the manufacturer but not the popular magazine in the clarity condition. No significant differences were found between the popular magazine and the manufacturer.

DISCUSSION

This study suggested new insight involving how readers perceive the credibility of health-related news stories in newspapers as a function of the attributed source of the information. This study also re-affirmed the validity of expertise and trustworthiness as underlying dimensions of credibility. However, a dimension called "thoroughness," rather than expertise, dealing with the completeness of the stories, seemed to better describe the expertise dimension. In addition, objectivity and clarity also emerged as dimensions of credibility.

Respondents evaluated the credibility of news stories dealing with the effectiveness of aspirin in reducing the re-occurrence of heart attacks among people who experienced heart attacks. There were three possible sources: (1) a medical journal (assumed to be high expertise and high trustworthiness), (2) a popular journal (low expertise and high trustworthiness), and (3) a pharmaceutical manufacturer which produces aspirin (high expertise and varying trustworthiness depending upon the message). In the manufacturer condition the manufacturer may have reported that aspirin was or was not effective in reducing heart attacks.

As hypothesized, the study found that the medical journal was judged more expert (thorough) than the popular journal and more trustworthy than the pharmaceutical company. But there was no support for the hypothesis

that the popular journal would be judged more trustworthy than the pharmaceutical manufacturer. The medical journal was judged as more trustworthy than either of the other two sources.

Respondents did not seem to make fine distinctions between trustworthiness and expertise when judging stories as functions of the source of the information. Respondents seemed to evaluate credibility as a single characteristic encompassing both trustworthiness and expertise. That is, a credible source was judged as both trustworthy and expert. The medical journal was judged as more credible than the other two sources. In addition, there seemed to be a "rub-off" effect where a source judged high in trustworthiness and expertise was also judged high in other dimensions as well. A source judged as trustworthy and expert was also judged as objective and clear. The medical journal story was judged superior to both the popular journal and the pharmaceutical company in objectivity; and superior to the pharmaceutical company in clarity.

Hypotheses dealing with source intent failed to find any significant differences between the good intent and bad intent sources. Even when the pharmaceutical company defied expectations of untrustworthiness and reported that aspirin does not reduce the likelihood of heart attacks among former heart patients that did not increase its credibility over the bad intent condition. Respondents remained leery of the pharmaceutical manufacturer no matter what its message. Even a message from a usually untrustworthy source that defied expectations of untrustworthiness could not significantly enhance its credibility. However, the neutral intent source (the combined medical journal and popular journal sources) was judged superior to either the good intent or bad intent source on each of the four dimensions of credibility. The neutral intent source was judged

superior to the good intent source on throroughness, and superior to the bad intent source on trustworthiness, objectivity, and clarity.

The findings in this study attest to the persuasive power of a high credibility source. But they suggest that for a source to to be evaluated as a high credibility source the source must be evaluated high in both expertise and trustworthiness. Merely being evaluated high on either one of these dimensions did not ensure high credibility. Respondents apparently evaluated source credibility in a very simple manner: "Either you have it or you don't." The respondents generally did not differentiate between a high trustworthy/low expertise source and a low trustworthy/high expertise source. The results of this study also suggest that source intent was not an important factor in increasing the credibility of a source with a vested interest in the information. But a neutral source with no vested interest in the information was generally judged as more credible than a source with a vested interest in the information, even if the vested interest source defied expectations of untrustworthiness and reported information contrary to its best interests.

NOTES

1. Serena Wade and Wilbur Schramm, "The Mass Media as Sources of Public Affairs, Science and Health Knowledge," Public Opinion Quarerly, 33:197-209 (1969); W.R. Wright, "Mass Media as Sources of Medical Information," Journal of Communication, 25:171-173 (1975); Vicki S. Freimuth, Rachel H. Greenberg, Jean DeWitt and Rose Mary Romano, "Covering Cancer: Newspaper and Public Interest," Journal of Communication, 34:62-73 (1984); James Ettema, James W. Brown and Russell V. Luepker, "Knowledge Gap Effects in Health Information Campaign," Public Opinion Quarterly, 47:516-527 (1983); Connie M. Kristiansen and Christina H. Harding, "The Mobilization of Health Behavior in Great Britain," Journalism Quarterly, 61:364-370 (1984).

2. James C. McCroskey, "Scales For the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, 33:65-72 (1966); David Berlo, James Lemert and R. Mertz, "Dimensions for Evaluating the Acceptability of Message Sources, Public Opinion Quarterly, 33:563-576 (1969).

3. Oscar H. Gandy, Beyond Agenda-Setting: Information Subsidies and Public Policy (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1982), p. 22.

4. Carl I. Hovland, Irving L. Janis and Harold H. Kelly, Communication and Persuasion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953).

5. MORI Research, Inc. Newspaper Credibility: Building Reader Trust (Minneapolis, MN, 1985).

6. Carl I. Hovland and Walter Weiss, "The Influence of Source Credibility," Public Opinion Quarterly, 15:635-650 (1951).

7. Cited in J.L. Whitehead, "Factors of Source Credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54:59-63 (1968), p. 59.

8. James C. McCroskey and Thomas A. Jenson, "Image of Mass Media News Sources," Journal of Broadcasting, 19:169-180 (1975); Michael Singletary, "Components of Credibility of Favorable News Source," Journalism Quarterly, 53:316-319 (1976); Nanacy R. Moiser and Andrew Ahlgren, "Credibility of Precision Journalism," Journalism Quarterly, 58:375-381, 518.

9. Judee Burgoon, Attributes of Newscasters' Voice as Credibility," Journalism Quarterly, 55:276-281 (1978); Moiser and Ahlgren, op. cit.

10. Carl I. Hovland and Wallace Mandell, "An Experimental Comparison of Conclusion-Drawing By the Communicator and the Audience," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47:581-588 (1952).

11. Elaine Walster, Elliot Aronson and Darcy Abrahams, "On Increasing the Persuasiveness of a Low Credibility Source," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 2:325-342 (1966).

12. Philip M. Boffey, "Aspirin Called Aid Against 2nd Heart Attack," New York Times, October 11, 1985. For the sake of saving space, only the first four paragraphs, which provide the gist of the article, are reproduced here:

    WASHINGTON, Oct. 10 — Federal health officials said today that heart attack victims and certain others who suffered heart pains could reduce the likelihood of dying from further heart attacks by taking an aspirin a day. They suggested that such aspirin treatments might save 30,000 to 50,000 lives per year.

    The health officials also said that a newly approved device that can be surgically implanted in patients to counteract severe irregularities in heartbeat might save 10,000 to 20,000 additional lives a year.

    Margaret M. Heckler, Secretary of Health and Human Services, said that the two new developments constituted "dramatic new progress against death from heart attacks."

    Secretary Heckler cautioned that studies reviewed by the Government did not show whether aspirin would be effective in preventing heart attacks in healthy people. Dr. Frank E. Young, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, advised heart patients to consult their physicians before adding aspirin to their treatments to prevent heart attacks.

13. Roger D. Wimmer and Joseph R. Dominick, Mass Media Research: An Introduction (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1983), p. 236. Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS, Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins and Karen Steinbrenner, SPSS: Statistical Package For the Social Sciences, 2nd Ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975)

14. Singletary, op. cit.

15. McCroskey and Jenson, op. cit.

16. James L. Bruning and B.L. Kintz, Computational Handbook of Statistics 2nd Ed. (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1977).

Table 1: Varimax Orthogonal Rotated Factor Matrix for the 28 Items

ITEM	MEAN	SD	THOROUGH $\bar{X}$=.14*	TRUSTWORTHY $\bar{X}$=.89	OBJECTIVE $\bar{X}$=.70	CLARITY $\bar{X}$=1.30	h^2
Complete	-.09	1.66	.82	.15	.30	.14	.80
Comprehensive	.44	1.69	.64	.29	.27	.30	.65
Skillful	.31	1.81	.69	.24	.27	.40	.77
Thorough	-.12	1.58	.80	.19	.21	.13	.74
Believeable	1.24	1.29	.14	.83	.15	.16	.75
Convincing	.71	1.64	.34	.64	.14	.35	.67
Honest	1.01	1.44	.24	.67	.40	.18	.70
Sincere	1.01	1.41	.36	.62	.37	.26	.71
True	.70	1.61	.34	.75	.23	.08	.74
Trustworthy	.67	1.50	.22	.70	.32	.30	.73
Fair	.77	1.63	.26	.25	.77	.27	.80
Impartial	.52	1.64	.24	.30	.79	.21	.82
Objective	.82	1.68	.16	.28	.86	.12	.85
Unbiased	.70	1.72	.23	.21	.79	.17	.76
Clear	1.27	1.45	.16	.17	.15	.80	.72
Readable	1.39	1.49	.17	.10	.20	.78	.69
Understandable	1.24	1.40	.29	.18	.28	.62	.58
Variance Explained			78%	9%	8%	6%**	
Alpha (reliability)			.91	.93	.94	.86	
RESIDUAL LOADINGS							
Accurate	.51	1.64	.63	.57	.30	.11	.82
Authoritative	.46	1.49	.57	.36	.06	.32	.56
Correct	.51	1.79	.51	.46	.25	.41	.69
Credible	.59	1.62	.45	.69	.32	.18	.81
Direct	1.30	1.40	.44	.30	.00	.44	.48
Exact	.47	1.54	.63	.48	.17	.25	.72
Expert	.34	1.65	.50	.34	.29	.50	.70
Factual	.70	1.69	.58	.49	.22	.12	.63
Precise	.65	1.55	.59	.41	.05	.41	.68
Professional	.26	1.75	.65	.36	.29	.41	.80
Reliable	.37	1.61	.54	.60	.31	.10	.76

*Grand Mean of Factor
**Sums to more than 100% because of rounding error

Table 2: Pearson Product Moment Correlations Among Factors

FACTOR	TRUSTWORTHY	OBJECTIVE	CLARITY*
THOROUGH	.65	.60	.55
TRUSTWORTHY		.64	.51
OBJECTIVE			.49

*All correlations are significant at $p < .001$

Table 3: One Way ANOVA of Thoroughness, Trustworthiness, Objectivity and Clarity as Functions of Source Intent

Story Thoroughness by Source Intent

	GOOD INTENT (n=49)	BAD INTENT (45)	NEUTRAL (95)
MEAN, SD	-.28, 1.62	.02, 1.36	.40, 1.47

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	422.15	188			
Between Groups	14.92	2	7.46	3.41	P < .05
Within Groups	407.23	186	2.19		

*

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at p < .05)

GROUP	GOOD INTENT	BAD INTENT	NEUTRAL
GOOD INTENT		*	
BAD INTENT			

Story Trustworthiness by Source Intent

	GOOD INTENT (n=50)	BAD INTENT (45)	NEUTRAL (96)
MEAN, SD	.83, 1.32	.51, 1.30	1.13, 1.17

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	303.19	190			
Between Groups	12.74	2	6.37	4.12	p < .05
Within Groups	290.45	188	1.55		

*

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at p < .05)

GROUP	GOOD INTENT	BAD INTENT	NEUTRAL
GOOD INTENT			
BAD INTENT		*	

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Table 3 (Continued)

Story Objectivity by Source Intent

	GOOD INTENT (n=50)	BAD INTENT (45)	NEUTRAL (96)
MEAN, SD	.66, 1.68	.02, 1.67	1.06, 1.31

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	455.11	188			
Between Groups	34.70	2	17.35	7.68	$p < .001$
Within Groups	420.41	186	2.26		

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at $p < .05$)

GROUP	GOOD INTENT	BAD INTENT	NEUTRAL
GOOD INTENT			
BAD INTENT		*	

Story Clarity by Source Intent

	GOOD INTENT (n=50)	BAD INTENT (45)	NEUTRAL (96)
MEAN, SD	1.11, 1.30	.99, 1.50	1.58, 1.05

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	303.40	190			
Between Groups	13.96	2	6.98	4.53	$p < .05$
Within Groups	289.44	188	1.54		

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at $p < .05$)

GROUP	GOOD INTENT	BAD INTENT	NEUTRAL
GOOD INTENT			
BAD INTENT		*	

Table 4: One Way ANOVA for Thoroughness, Trustworthiness, Objectivity and Clarity as Functions of Source Credibility

Story Thoroughness by Source Credibility

	MEDICAL JOURNAL (n=46)	POPULAR J (49)	MANUFACTURER (94)
MEAN, SD	.78, 1.24	.04, 1.58	-.12, 1.49

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	422.15	188			
Between Groups	25.82	2	12.91	6.06	p < .01
Within Groups	396.34	186	2.13		

*

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at p < .05)

GROUP	MEDICAL JOURNAL	POPULAR J	MANUFACTURER
MEDICAL J		*	*
POPULAR J			

Story Trustworthiness by Source Credibility

	MEDICAL JOURNAL (n=47)	POPULAR J (49)	MANUFACTURER (95)
MEAN, SD	1.50, 1.02	.77, 1.21	.66, 1.31

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	303.19	190			
Between Groups	22.85	2	11.42	7.66	P < .001
Within Groups	280.34	188	1.49		

*

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at p < .05)

GROUP	MEDICAL JOURNAL	POPULAR J	MANUFACTURER
MEDICAL J		*	*
POPULAR J			

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

Table 4 (Continued)

Story Objectivity by Source Credibility

	MEDICAL JOURNAL (n=47)	POPULAR J (48)	MANUFACTURER (94)
MEAN, SD	1.46, 1.11	.66, 1.39	.32, 1.70

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	455.11	188			
Between Groups	40.28	2	20.14	9.03	p < .001
Within Groups	414.83	186	2.23		

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at p < .05)

GROUP	MEDICAL JOURNAL	POPULAR J	MANUFACTURER
MEDICAL J		*	*
POPULAR J			

Story Clarity by Source Credibility

	MEDICAL JOURNAL (n=47)	POPULAR J (49)	MANUFACTURER (95)
MEAN, SD	1.76, 1.00	1.42, 1.08	1.05, 1.40

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	PROB
Total	303.39	190			
Between Groups	16.46	2	8.23	5.39	p < .01
Within Groups	286.93	188	1.53		

Scheffe's Significance Test Matrix (at p < .05)

GROUP	MEDICAL JOURNAL	POPULAR J	MANUFACTURER
MEDICAL J			*
POPULAR J			